

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10

11 CHARLES ANTHONY BROOKS,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 M. LUNDI, et al.,

15 Defendants.  
16

No. 2:17-cv-1668 KJN P

ORDER

17 Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed a civil rights action pursuant to 42  
18 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff has filed an application to proceed in forma pauperis pursuant to 28  
19 U.S.C. § 1915.


20 The federal venue statute provides that a civil action “may be brought in (1) a judicial  
21 district in which any defendant resides, if all defendants are residents of the State in which the  
22 district is located, (2) a judicial district in which a substantial part of the events or omissions  
23 giving rise to the claim occurred, or a substantial part of property that is the subject of the action  
24 is situated, or (3) if there is no district in which an action may otherwise be brought as provided in  
25 this action, any judicial district in which any defendant is subject to the court’s personal  
26 jurisdiction with respect to such action.” 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).

27 In this case, the claim arose in San Mateo County, which is in the Northern District of  
28 California. In addition, it appears that most defendants are located in the Northern District.

1 Therefore, plaintiff's claim should have been filed in the United States District Court for the  
2 Northern District of California. In the interest of justice, a federal court may transfer a complaint  
3 filed in the wrong district to the correct district. See 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a); Starnes v. McGuire,  
4 512 F.2d 918, 932 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

5 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this matter is transferred to the United  
6 States District Court for the Northern District of California.

7 Dated: August 25, 2017

8   
9 KENDALL J. NEWMAN  
10 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

11 broo1668.21  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28